

<b>Application No:</b> 2009/338		<b>Application Type:</b> Full	
<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of two detached dwellings and one bungalow, with access from Rawsthorne Avenue	<b>Location:</b>	Land to rear of 27 Helmshore Road Haslingden
<b>Report of:</b>	Planning Unit Manager	<b>Status:</b>	For Publication
<b>Report to:</b>	Development Control Committee	<b>Date:</b>	5 October 2009
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mrs Y Malley	<b>Determination Expiry Date:</b> 21 September 2009	
<b>Agent:</b>	Alan Kinder Associates		

**REASON FOR REPORTING** **Tick Box**

**Outside Officer Scheme of Delegation**

**Member Call-In**

Name of Member:  
Reason for Call-In:

**More than 3 objections received**

Other (please state) .....

**HUMAN RIGHTS**

The relevant provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 and the European Convention on Human Rights have been taken into account in the preparation of this report, particularly the implications arising from the following rights:-

**Article 8**

The right to respect for private and family life, home and correspondence.

**Article 1 of Protocol 1**

The right of peaceful enjoyment of possessions and protection of property.

## **APPLICATION DETAILS**

### **1. SITE**

The application site presently forms part of the rear garden of a detached residential property located on the western side of Helmshore Road.

The site is broadly rectangular in shape and abuts the boundary with a large detached dwelling known as Hurst Bank to the north, and residential dwellings 29 Helmshore Road and Kelholm to the south, and 25 Rawsthorne Avenue to the west. The site can be accessed from Rawsthorne Avenue to its west side, slopes gently from the east and is somewhat higher than the neighbouring property to the south. Currently, the site is bounded by fences/hedges of varying height.

Rawsthorne Avenue is characterised by a mix of semi-detached dwellings and bungalows, sloping downwards to a detached house with private, gated access (25 Rawsthorne Avenue). Bounding its south westerly edge are timber panel fencing and a dwarf stone wall with trees and shrubs behind. The Avenue does not have a turning head and there is a mix of on-street and off-street parking along the Avenue.

The site lies within the Urban Boundary as designated in the Rossendale District Local Plan.

### **2. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

The site has an extensive planning history.

At its meeting on 21 June 2005 Committee resolved to grant Outline Permission 2005/275, subject to conditions, for the erection of 3 dwellings on land to rear of 27 Helmshore Road. On 24 July 2007 Committee granted the Reserved Matters Approval 2007/202 for the construction of 3 detached bungalows. In the determination of the Reserved Matters application Committee considered the implications of the Planning Inspectorate's decision to dismiss the Appeal in respect of Planning Application 2006/677.

Planning Application 2006/677, for the erection of 3 detached houses on the site, was refused by Officers on the following grounds:

1. It is considered that the development is not currently required to meet the housing requirements of the borough.
2. The proposed development would, by reason of its size, position and design, be a prominent and intrusive feature in the area and which would adversely affect the visual character of the area.
3. The proposed development would, by reason of its size, position and design, have a significant over looking and over bearing impact on the amenities of nearby residents.

In dismissing the Appeal in respect of 2006/677 solely on the basis of the impact the proposed dwellings would have on the amenities of neighbours, the Inspector concluded on each of the Council's grounds for refusal as follows:

1. The Appeal proposal would not exacerbate housing over supply as outline permission for the erection of 3 dwellings on the site already exists.
2. Policy DC7 of the Rossendale District Local Plan, which seeks to protect the character of extensive grounds of existing dwellings, pre-dates the Government guidance of PPS3. PPS3 seeks to make efficient use of land and warns that the "*density of existing development should not dictate that of new housing by stifling change or requiring replication of existing style or form*"..... The garden to No 27 is roughly rectangular in shape and, as a result, any proposal for 3 detached dwellings is likely to have a similar layout to that proposed.....Given the variety in the form and siting of buildings in the vicinity, I do not consider that the proposed dwellings would look out of place.....Subsequent to the submission of the Appeal the Council issued a Tree Preservation Order with respect to two trees on the site. However, I agree with the Appellant that these trees have a limited impact on the public realm and, provided they were replaced, I do not consider their loss would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.
3. The proposed houses would sit in a line behind No. 27 with their front and rear windows facing the rear gardens of the properties on either side. ....On the north side, the party-boundary with Hurst Bank is formed in part by a leylandii hedge of around 4m in height and a hedge of about 2.5m. This, and the distance between the proposed houses and Hurst Bank would prevent any undue loss of privacy for occupiers of this existing property from the proposed properties and vice-versa.....To the south side, there is a hedge of about 1.5m on the party-boundary with No 29. However, this would not prevent the occupiers of the new houses looking, at close quarters, into the back garden of No 29. The house proposed on Plot 3 would also overlook the large garden of the house at the end of Rawsthorne Avenue.

Since the receipt of the Appeal decision and approval of the Reserved Matters application 2007/202, Planning Applications 2007/467 and 2007/468 for the erection of 3 and 2 detached houses respectively, were refused by officers. The applicant's appealed two decisions to refuse an earlier planning application, 2007/356 (for the erection of two detached dwelling houses) , and the 2007/467 application (for the erection of three detached dwelling houses), and the Inspectorate determined these two appeals simultaneously. On the 9 April 2008 Application 2007/467 was allowed on Appeal, subject to conditions. The appeal on Application 2007/356 was dismissed.

In allowing application 2007/467 the Inspector concluded that:

- Given the mixed character of development in the area the two storey dwellings would not appear out of place
- Given the distance from the boundaries of the site and the distance between the dwellings themselves they would not appear significantly overbearing when viewed from the existing houses and their gardens

- For similar reasons there would not be any significant loss of privacy for the occupiers of neighbouring houses from within their properties
- Given the existing hedges and proposed additional screening the access arrangements (from Helmsshore Road) would not cause any undue levels of noise or disturbance to the occupiers of Hurst Bank.

There have been four further planning applications since the approval of 2007/467:

- Application 2007/606  
Erection of two dormer bungalows and one house  
Dismissed on appeal
- Application 2007/607  
Erection of three detached dwellings houses  
Refused by Officers, Appeal Withdrawn
- Planning Application 2007/628  
Erection of three detached bungalows  
Refused by Officers, Appeal Withdrawn
- Planning Application 2008/0391  
Erection of 3 detached dormer bungalows  
Planning Application Withdrawn

In dismissing the Appeal for application 2007/606 the Inspector concluded that:

1. With dormer windows to the roof slope, as well as projecting gables to the front and rear, there would be significant number of windows at first floor level. Due to the closeness to the boundary and their large footprint, combined with the 1m change in levels between garden, the bungalows (which would be more akin to two storey houses) would appear overbearing when seen from No.29's garden. The bungalows would be 2 metres closer to the boundary than the houses allowed on appeal and their roof height would be taller than the eaves of the approved houses, which would give them no less visual impact.
2. Harmful direct overlooking of No.29's garden, equivalent to that for which the first appeal was dismissed, would only be prevented by the proposal to make all first floor windows to the rear obscure glazed and non openable, which would be a contrived design solution, which would not prevent activity within the rooms being discernable from No.29's side and would create a perception of loss of privacy that would add to the harmful effect on the use and enjoyment of it's garden.
3. The proposed house to the west of the site, although only 6 metres from the southern boundary with No.25 Rawsthorpe Avenue, and closer to the western boundary would not be unduly overbearing because of the layout of No.25 and its garden.
4. The reliance on obscure glazed fixed windows at first floor level to avoid overlooking of No.25 and its garden is a contrived solution that would not prevent some adverse intrusive impact on the neighbouring residents and would result in poor living conditions for residents of the proposed house, who should expect some outlook from a habitable room.

5. The front of the proposed house to the west would overlook the western end of the garden of Hurst Bank to the north, but only an area of mature trees. The house would be some 2m away from the boundary that that allowed on the earlier appeal. The boundary with Hurst Bank is formed by tall hedges. Helped by their enclosing effect, the dormer bungalows would in my view be far enough away not to appear overbearing.
6. The distance between facing windows of the middle house and Hurst Bank would be greater than spacing commonly accepted to protect privacy in suburban areas. The effect on living conditions would not be unacceptable.

Also worthy of note is Application 2009/318, for the erection of a 1-storey side extension to 27 Helmshore Road. This application was approved by Officers. If a material start was to be made on this permission, then any extant permissions for dwellings to the rear of No.27 to be served off Helmshore Road could not be implemented.

### **3. THE PROPOSAL**

The applicant seeks permission for the erection of two detached houses and a detached bungalow, with access from Rawsthorne Avenue. Following representations received from neighbours the applicant has amended the red edge of the application site, removing a triangular section of land to the west that is not within their control.

The house to be sited on Plot 1 (nearest to Rawsthorne Avenue) would measure 7 metres high with a maximum depth of 10.8 metres and a width of 13.6 metres. A detached double garage is proposed to the west in a set back position from the house. The garage would measure 7 metres wide with a depth of 6 metres, reaching a height of 4.2 metres with a hipped roof.

The proposed house to be in a central location within the site (Plot 2) would measure 19.6 metres wide (including an attached single storey double garage), with a height and depth equal to that of Plot 1. Both houses would have projecting front and rear gables (included in the measurements described above). The houses would be on a north/south alignment with the rear elevations fronting the garden area of No. 29 Helmshore Road and the side garden area of 25 Rawsthorne Avenue, with Kelholm to the rear of that garden.

The detached bungalow would measure 13.5 metres wide with a depth of 11.2 metres and reach a height of 5.5 metres with a hipped roof. The bungalow would have to gables to the front (included in the measurements described above), one of which would serve as a single garage. The bungalow would be offset from the alignment of the two dwellings by approximately 20 degrees to the west. Accordingly it would be on a north west/south east alignment.

All of the properties would be constructed in natural stone and slate with cast stone window surrounds with drip moulds. All would be accessed via a driveway formed near to the northern boundary of the site. Off street parking provision would consist of three spaces for the two dwellings and 2 for the detached bungalow. All properties would have gardens to the front and the rear, and individual bin storage areas.

A turning head has been proposed for use by residents on Rawsthorne Avenue, to the north west of the site which would also allow for the turning of refuse vehicles. A smaller turning head is proposed to the west for use by occupants of the bungalow.

It is stated that all boundaries would be heavily planted and a 1.8 metre close boarded timber fence would be erected to aid privacy.

#### Bedrooms and separation distances

Plot one would have 4 bedrooms, three of which would be sited to the north elevation with windows projecting north. One bedroom would be located to the rear, this bedroom would have two windows, one would be an obscure glazed window facing south, the other would be clear glazed facing west.

The nearest habitable room window to the north boundary would be 7.1 metres away. The nearest habitable room window to the south boundary would be .4 metres away, however, this window would be obscure glazed. Neither window would directly face any habitable room windows of neighbours.

Plot two would also have 4 bedrooms, This property would also have three of the bedrooms sited to the north elevation with windows projecting north and one bedroom to the rear with two windows, one of which would be obscure glazed facing south, the other, clear glazed facing west.

The nearest habitable room window to the north boundary would be 9 metres away. The nearest habitable room window to the south boundary would be 6.9 metres away, however, this window would be obscure glazed. The window facing north would be approximately 23 metres away from the nearest habitable room window of Hurst Bank.

The proposed bungalow (Plot 3) would have three bedrooms, one sited to the north, one sited to the south and one to the east. None of the windows are proposed to be obscure glazed. The nearest habitable room window to the north boundary would be 7.2 metres away. The nearest habitable room window to the south would be 7 metres away.

Finished floor levels would be as follows:

Plot 1: 234.150

Plot 2: 235.150

Plot 3: 235.500

## **4. POLICY CONTEXT**

### **National Planning Guidance**

PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development

PPS3 Housing

PPG13 Transport

### **Development Plan**

Regional Spatial Strategy (2008)

DP1-9 Spatial Principles

- RDF 1 Spatial Priorities
- L 4 Regional Housing Provision
- L 5 Affordable Housing
- RT 2 Managing Travel Demand
- RT 4 Management of the Highway Network
- EM 1 Environmental Assets

Rossendale District Local Plan (1995)

- DS1 Urban Boundary
- DC1 Development Criteria
- DC4 Materials

**Other Material Planning Considerations**

- DFT Manual for Streets
- 4NW Draft Partial Review of the RSS
- LCC Parking Standards
- RBC Core Strategy
- RBC Interim Housing Policy Statement (July 2008)

**5. CONSULTATIONS**

LCC (Highway)

No objection to the proposal. They do, however, request that the proposed turning facility be constructed to adoptable standards and a scheme of street lighting and highway drainage installed before occupation of the proposed dwellings.

**6. REPRESENTATIONS**

To accord with the General Development Procedure Order two site notices were posted on 28/07/09 and 30 neighbours were notified by letter on 31/07/09. Two further site notices were posted and letters sent to neighbours on the 11/09/09 as a result of amended plans. The site notices have been posted to go above and beyond the regulatory requirement to ensure a high level of Community engagement to accord with PPS1.

Fourteen letters of objection have been received resulting from the first period of notification, including a representation from Cllr Granville Morris. The objections relate to:

- Would exacerbate traffic problems on Rawsthorne Avenue
- Would create further dangers to children playing on Rawsthorne Avenue
- Inadequate turning facility
- Loss of light, privacy and outlook
- Noise
- Three houses are not necessary in this location
- The application would conflict with the Council's interim Housing Policy
- The red edged application site is incorrect
- Insufficient garden space
- Noise and smell as properties would have no access to drainage or sewage pipes

- As the houses do not appear affordable they must be contrary to the Council's affordable housing policy
- Loss of view
- The application doesn't differ particularly from any of the previous refusals, and has only been designed for the purposes of increased profits.
- Ill conceived design, a mismatch of the previous two approvals
- The current application is sited 2 metres closer to the southern boundary than the application that was approved on appeal which increases the loss of privacy and amenity for neighbours to the south.
- Obscure glazing is contrary to government guidance on the importance of well considered design in new housing
- The development is contrary to the identified housing needs of the Greenfield Ward that requires bungalows and affordable housing.
- The application, with specific references to the separation distances would not accord with the standards laid down by the Inspector when dismissing appeal 2007/606.

Three representations have been received to date relating to the second round of consultation:

- The residents of 31 Helmshore Road have stated that nothing significant has changed. The footprint of the site is still too close to the southern boundary and the erection of a 1.8 metre fence with planting is merely cosmetic.
- A resident of 21 Rawsthorne Avenue has reiterated objections relating to traffic impact, turning and inadequate turning.
- An email has been received from Mr Bob Rawlinson requesting clarification over the planned height of the garage to the west of the site for Plot 1 in relation to the land to the south and how the levels of the houses would relate to Rawsthorne Avenue. The case officer has contacted the agent for further information with regards to this. It is anticipated that information should be received and reported to Members via the Update Report.

## **7. ASSESSMENT**

The main considerations relating to this application are: 1) Principle 2) Visual Amenity 3) Neighbour Amenity 4) Highway Safety.

### Principle

Application 2007/202 for the erection of three bungalows with access from Rawsthorne Avenue was approved on the 2 August 2007 and therefore is still capable of being implemented.

Application 2007/467 for the erection of 3 detached houses with access from Helmshore Road was allowed on appeal 09/04/2008. Accordingly this application is also still capable of being implemented.

The principle of three dwellings being erected on this site has already been established, as too has access from Rawsthorne Avenue.



### Visual Amenity

PPS1 sets out the Government's national policies on different aspects of land use planning, including overarching policies on the delivery of sustainable development through the planning system. Amongst its 'key principles' is that "*planning policies should promote high quality inclusive design in the layout of new developments and individual buildings in terms of function and impact, not just for the short-term but over the lifetime of the development. Design which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area should not be accepted*".

Paragraphs 33-39 of PPS1 amplify upon this, indicating that "...*Good design is indivisible from good planning.....High quality and inclusive design should be the aim of all those involved in the development process.....*". In similar vein, Policy DP7 of the RSS and EM1 inter alia, seek to promote environmental quality, whilst PPS3 has as its key goal ensuring that "*everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home*" and speaks of "*desirability of achieving high quality, well-designed housing*".

The surrounding area has a range of house types, sizes, designs and facing materials. Having regard also to the extant permissions for the site, the proposed dwellings are considered acceptable. This view is consistent with the conclusions of Inspectors assessing previous applications made on the site. The enclosed nature of the site, taking into consideration the existing and proposed landscaping, along with the existing houses in the area would mean that the proposed houses would not be unduly prominent in the area, and the proposed bungalow (being sited to the east of the site) even less so.

The proposed materials are considered appropriate. The extent of private amenity space for each property is considered adequate for the needs of future occupiers. The proposed bin-storage areas are adequate and not overly prominent.

It is considered that a more detailed scheme of landscaping/boundary treatment to the north west part of the site would be required due to its direct relationship with the street scene of Rawsthorne Avenue. However, it is considered that such details can be achieved by appropriately worded conditions. Taking all of the above into consideration the scheme is considered acceptable in visual amenity terms.

### Neighbour Amenity

Taking firstly direct window-to-window separation distances and separation distances between buildings, regard should be had to the Council's adopted SDP on residential alterations and extensions. The clear glazed habitable room windows of both of the two houses and the bungalow would be above the minimum requirement as stated within the Council's SPD.

With respect to overlooking of neighbours gardens, in dismissing the appeal for Application 2007/606 the Inspector opined that by obscure-glazing bedroom windows (that had no other external openings) to avoid undue overlooking resulted in a contrived design solution which was poor design and therefore contrary to the principles of PPS1 and PPS3. In the case of the current application, although the proposed houses would have an obscure glazed bedroom window facing neighbouring properties, the houses have been designed so that an additional window

is proposed to each of these bedrooms, these additional windows would be clear glazed and do not face the neighbours. It is therefore considered that the designs on this occasion cannot be regarded as poor/ unacceptable.

Whilst it is considered that significant weight should be attached to extant approvals on the site, some regard should also be had to previous inspectors appeal decisions on the site. Of note is the appeal decision relating to application 2007/606 which was dismissed and the extant approval 2007/467, allowed on appeal.

In relation to the potential overbearing nature of the dwellings on the garden area of Hurst Bank, taking into consideration the separation distances and the existing boundary treatment which would be retained it is considered that the scheme would not be unduly detrimental.

The Inspector considered that as the houses proposed under Application 2007/606 would be some 2 metres closer to the boundary than the houses allowed on appeal and that their roof height would be taller than the eaves of the approved houses, they would appear overbearing, and there would be a perception of overlooking created from windows to the rear, although they would be obscure glazed.

The current application proposes the house on Plot 1 be a minimum of 7.3 metres and a maximum of 8 metres way from the southern boundary. Dismissed application 2007/606 proposed a minimum distance of 6 metres at its nearest point reaching a maximum of 6.9 (due to its offset orientation). Accordingly, the proposed scheme would be an improvement with regard to this. Extant approval 2007/467 proposed a minimum distance of 7.8 metres and a maximum of approximately 8.9. This house was approximately 0.7 metres higher at ridge height and 0.5 metres higher at eaves level. On balance therefore it is considered that the proposed distance would not have an unduly overbearing effect on the rear garden areas to the south over and above the extant approval.

Plot 2 would have a minimum distance of 7 metres and a maximum of 9m away from the southern boundary, with the bulk of the house being 9 metres away. Application 2007/606 proposed a minimum distance of 6.8 metres and a maximum of 7.2 metres away. The extant approval 2007/467 has a separation distance of 8.7 metres away. In respect of the above it is considered that as the majority of the house would be further away from the southern boundary than 2007/606 and the extant approval 2007/467 the house on Plot 2 would not be unduly overbearing on the garden areas to the south.

The proposed bungalow would be a minimum of 6.4 metres away from the boundary and 11 metres from the southern boundary. The minimum distance of the 2007/606 application was 8 metres. However, this was for a two storey dwelling and not a bungalow. The extant 2007/467 approval was 10.1 metres away. However, this was also for a dwelling two storeys in height. Due to the single storey nature of the proposal taking into account proposed boundary treatment, it is considered that the proposed bungalow would not be unduly overbearing on the rear garden of No.29.

#### Highway Safety

Concerns have been expressed regarding increased traffic along Rawsthorne Avenue and the lack of a turning facility at the bottom of the Avenue.

Inevitably as a result of the permission there would be some increase in traffic along Rawsthorne Avenue. However, permission already exists for three dwellings on the site to be served off this road and the Highways Authority has not objection to the proposal. A turning head is proposed at the site entrance, which would go some way towards addressing the problems that presently arise due to lack of a turning-head at the end of the road. A condition is proposed to ensure its provision in a form that satisfies the Highway Authority (and will allow a refuse vehicle to turn around).

The parking and turning facilities within the site, for use by occupiers/visitors of each of the proposed dwellings are acceptable

## **8. SUMMARY REASON FOR APPROVAL**

The proposed development is considered acceptable in principle within the Urban Boundary and having regard to extant permissions for the site, and would not unduly detract from visual and neighbour amenity or highway safety. It is therefore considered that the proposal accords with the provisions of PPS1/ PPS3/PPG13, Policies DP 1-9 / L4 / RT2 / RT4 / EM1 of the Regional Spatial Strategy, Policies DS1 / DC1 DC4 of the Rossendale District Local Plan, and the Council's Interim Housing Policy Statement (July 2008).

## **9. RECOMMENDATION**

That permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

## **10. CONDITIONS**

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the 9 April 2011.  
Reason: Required by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase 2004 Act and accord with extant permissions for the site.
2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plans dated 28 July 2009 and amended plans dated 20 August 2009.  
Reason: To ensure the development complies with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt.
3. Prior to the commencement of development samples of the facing materials to be used in the elevations and roof of the proposed development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved materials and shall not be varied without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.  
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development, to accord with Policy DC1 of the Rossendale District Local Plan.
4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, as amended, or any order amending or revoking and re-enacting that Order, no development contained within

Classes A-E of Part One, Schedule Two of that Order shall be carried out without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To avoid alterations/additions to the building or the erection of outbuildings that will detract to an unacceptable extent from visual or neighbour amenity, in accordance with Policy DC1 of the Rossendale District Local Plan.

5. Notwithstanding the details shown on the submitted drawings or the application forms, prior to the commencement of development a scheme of landscaping/ boundary treatment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. The submitted details shall include : the location of all existing trees and hedgerows on the site and shall specify those that are to be retained and the measures to be taken to protect them during construction of the development; the planting proposed; the areas to be hard-surfaced; the fences/walls/gates to be erected; and any changes of ground-level proposed.

Reason: In the interests of visual & neighbour amenity and highway safety, in accordance with Policy DC1 of the Rossendale District Local Plan.

- 6 All hard-landscaping/gates/walls/fences in the approved scheme of landscaping/boundary treatment shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of any of the dwellings hereby permitted, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation. All planting in the approved scheme of landscaping/boundary treatment shall be implemented in the first planting season thereafter. Any trees or plants which within a period of five years of substantial completion of the development die, are removed or become diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives consent to any variation.

Reason : In the interests of visual & neighbour amenity, in accordance with Policy DC1 of the Rossendale District Local Plan.

- 7 The existing boundary treatment within the site and with the adjoining properties 29 Helmshore Road and Hurst Bank shall be retained in perpetuity, unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason : In the interests of visual & neighbour amenity, in accordance with Policy DC1 of the Rossendale District Local Plan.

8. The garages hereby permitted shall not be used for any other purposes than for the parking of cars.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy DC1 of the Rossendale District Local Plan.

9. Prior to commencement of development full details of the proposed access, driveways and tuning areas to be provided, and associated drainage/lighting, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and shall not be varied unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reason: In the interests

of visual amenity and highway safety in accordance with Policy DC1 of the Rossendale District Local Plan.

10. All obscure glazed windows as stated within the applicant's supporting information and on the approved drawings shall be provided/retained as obscure-glazed and non-opening windows.

Reason: in the interests of neighbour amenity, in accordance with Policy DC1 of the Rossendale District Local Plan.

- 11 Any construction works associated with the development hereby approved shall not take place except between the hours of 7:00 am and 7:00 pm Monday to Friday and 8:00 am to 1:00 pm on Saturdays. No construction shall take place on Sundays, Good Friday, Christmas Day or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of neighbours in accordance with Policy DC1 of the Rossendale District Local Plan.

<b>Contact Officer</b>	
Name	Richard Elliott
Position	Planning Officer
Service / Team	Development Control
Telephone	01706 238639
Email address	richardelliott@rossendalebc.gov.uk